



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/600,083	09/13/2000	Timo Kauhanen	PM 271467	6680

7590 03/17/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP.
1600 TYSONS BOULEVARD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HUY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/600,083

Applicant(s)

KAUHANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D Nguyen

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,18,19,27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6,8-17 and 20-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 7, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buskens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,250).

Regarding claims 1-2, 7, 18-19, Buskens et al. disclose a cluster mobile switching center using modular software objects in performing the functions of the system. When a user receives or requests a call, the user object initiates a call software object SO.sub.Cn, which in turn initiates user-connection objects SO.sub.CONNn for each connection in the call. User software object SO.sub.U1 has two call software objects SO.sub.C1 and SO.sub.C2, indicative, for example, of a conference call, user software object SO.sub.Un has a single call software object SO.sub.C1, which is the normal situation, and user software object SO.sub.U2 has no call software objects, since this user is involved in an incoming call. A call software object may have one or more user-connection objects; call software objects SO.sub.C1 and SO.sub.C2 of user software object SO.sub.U1 each have a single user connection object SO.sub.CONN1, while call software object SO.sub.C1 of user software object SO.sub.Un has two user-connection objects

Art Unit: 2684

SO.sub.CONN1 and SO.sub.CONN2. In this way the user signaling server can support multi-connection calls, which is a key requirement for third generation systems (Col. 8, line 63 – Col. 9, line 11).

2. Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghisler (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,755).

Regarding claims 27-28, Ghisler teaches a method and an arrangement for enabling multiple calls to be conducted simultaneously between a radio base station and a single radio terminal. Multiple calls can be transmitted and received simultaneously via a single radio terminal. The radio terminal is connected over a radio air-interface to the radio base station. When a first call is to be set up, a control channel is accessed between the radio terminal and the radio base station, and the first call is set up between the radio base station and the radio terminal on a traffic channel. A second call may be set up between the radio base station and the radio terminal, without terminating the first call, by signalling over the established traffic channel of the first call. The second call is then set up on a second traffic channel (Col. 2, lines 38-47).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3-6, 8-17, 20-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 3 and 20, the cited prior arts fail to teach that the criterion is a preference of a user of subscriber terminal.

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding claims 4 and 21, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of indicating in a call setup signalling from subscriber equipment to network whether the new bearer is required or whether existing bearer is to be used.

Regarding claims 5-6 and 22, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of indicating in a call setup signalling which existing bearer is to be used.

Regarding claims 8-9 and 23, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of changing a call currently being on a shared bearer to use a new dedicated bearer.

Regarding claims 10-11 and 24, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of changing a call currently using a dedicated bearer to use another bearer shared with at least other call.

Regarding claims 12 and 26, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of putting an existing call on an existing bearer of multicall into a hold mode prior to setting up said new call on said existing bearer.

Regarding claim 13, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of alternating the calls on a shared bearer between an active mode and hold mode by the user.

Regarding claim 14, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of sending a hold message containing a transaction identifier of a call in order to put the respective call on hold.

Regarding claims 15-16 and 25, the cited prior arts fail to teach a step of offering a new subscriber-equipment-terminating call to the user by means of a call waiting supplementary service.

Regarding claim 17, the cited prior arts fail to teach the method of controlling multicall wherein telecommunications system comprises two telecommunications networks of different generations, the first one of the telecommunications networks supporting both shared bearers and

Art Unit: 2684

dedicated bearers for a multicall, and the second one of the telecommunications networks supporting only the shared bearers for a multicall, and method comprises an inter-network multicall handover comprising the steps of putting calls of the multicall subjected to handover irrespective of whether they have been in a dedicated bearer mode or a shared bearer mode, on a common shared bearer in first network prior to the handover, carrying out of handover multicall onto a shared bearer in second telecommunications network.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Lopez-Torres (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,647) teach Communication system, mobile services switching center and method for establishing a multi-dialogue communication between subscriber stations.
- King (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,343) teaches GSM transceiver controlling timing races in channel establishment in a GSM protocol stack and method of operation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-3283. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Hunter can be reached on 703-308-6732. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/600,083

Page 6


Art Unit: 2684

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-6750.

HN

March 5, 2003


THANH CONG LE 3/10/03
PRIMARY EXAMINER
